

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of a brownish-black, viscid semi-liquid of empyreumatic odor, containing chiefly wood tar, mineral matter similar to talc, and a small amount of glycerin.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof, appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons and in the leaflet accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy and cure for bronchitis, congestion of the lungs, acute, inflammatory, and articular rheumatism, suppressed menstruation, and all inflammatory conditions, as a remedy for pneumonia, typhoid fever, tonsillitis, diphtheria, grip, croup, tuberculosis, whooping cough, lumbago, carbuncle, pleurisy, headlitis, and measles, as a cure for pneumonia fever, if taken in time as an absolute cure for all forms of tuberculosis, as an absolute cure for pneumonia fever, as a treatment and remedy for all forms of tuberculosis, and as a preventive of tuberculosis, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On September 22, 1919, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

E. D. BALE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

S792. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. John D. Ravazulas [Ravazula] and Lyssandros D. Ravazulas [Ravazula] (Ravazulas [Ravazula] Bros.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75. (F. & D. No. 9504. I. S. No. 14812-r.)

On March 5, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against John D. Ravazulas [Ravazula] and Lyssandros D. Ravazulas [Ravazula], co-partners, trading as Ravazulas [Ravazula] Bros., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 29, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of an article purporting to be olive oil, which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled, (can) "Net Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon Prodotti Italiana Olio Di Oliva Pure Olive Oil Sopraffino Italia Brand Trade Mark Lucca Toscana Italia."

Examination of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed it to consist almost entirely of cottonseed oil and to be short measure.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for pure olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, designs, and devices regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, borne on the label, to wit, "Prodotti Italiani Olio Di Oliva Pure Olive Oil Sopraffino Italia Brand Trade Mark Lucca Toscana Italia" and "Net Contents $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon," were false and misleading in that they purported and represented the article to be a pure olive oil produced in the kingdom of Italy, and the net contents of said packages to be $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon, whereas, in truth and in fact, the article was not a pure olive oil and was not produced in the kingdom of Italy, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and the net contents of said packages were less than $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon; for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was a pure olive oil produced in the kingdom of Italy, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a pure olive oil and was not produced in the

kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic article consisting of a mixture of cottonseed and olive oil; for the further reason that it purported by its label to be a foreign product, to wit, a product produced in the kingdom of Italy, whereas it was not a foreign product, but was a product produced in the United States of America; and for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of food in said package was less than $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon, and the quantity of food so contained therein was not marked on the outside of said packages in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On March 19, 1919, a plea of not guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant firm. On November 17, 1920, the plea of not guilty was withdrawn and a plea of guilty entered, and the court imposed a fine of \$75.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8793. Misbranding of C. G. Remedy. U. S. * * * v. S Bottles of C. G. Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11233. I. S. No. 8410-r. S. No. C-1465.)

On or about September 20, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 8 bottles of C. G. Remedy, at Blytheville, Ark., consigned by the Allan-Pfeiffer Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo., on or about June 16, 1919, alleging that the article had been transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Arkansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, (carton) "C. G. Remedy for Gonorrhœa and Gleet * * * C. G. Remedy for Male and Female * * * C. G. Remedy * * * A combination of ingredients of recognized value for the treatment of Gonorrhœa and Gleet * * * This Remedy Produces Prompt Relief," (bottle) "B & B C. G. Remedy For the cure and prevention of Gonorrhœa (clap) Blennorrhœa (gleet) Leucorrhœa (whites) and Allied Forms of Acute and Chronic Inflammatory Mucous Discharges from the Urethra (Urine Canal) * * *."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of zinc salts, boric acid, eucalyptol, phenol, glycerin, unidentified plant extractives, and water.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the product was misbranded in violation of section 10 [8] of the Food and Drugs Act, paragraph 3, as amended, in that the labels on said carton and bottle were false and misleading and fraudulent, none of the contents having the therapeutic effects claimed.

On November 22, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8794. Misbranding of macaroni. U. S. * * * v. V. Viviano & Bros., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 11348. I. S. No. 9750-p.)

On March 26, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against V. Viviano & Bros., a corporation, St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about October 24, 1917, from the State of Missouri into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of macaroni which was misbranded. The article was labeled, "Mulino & Pastificio Elettrico Sil-